REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, and 18-20 have been amended.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone conference on June 14, 2006. During the telephone conference, the Examiner and applicants' representative discussed the invention and the cited reference.

The Examiner has refused to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 7, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider his refusal. The Information Disclosure Statement describes facts surrounding a possible public use. Applicant has a duty to disclose to the Examiner any information that applicant believes is material to the "patentability" under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, which includes information on "possible prior public uses." (M.P.E.P. § 2001.04.) All the facts recited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 7, 2006, are facts relating to the possible public use and necessarily may be considered to relate to "patentability" under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56. The Examiner is correct in his position that the Information Disclosure Statement "presents factual evidence relating to 'patentability,' which is required to be disclosed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56. Applicant is unaware of any requirement that information provided to the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 needs to be in the form of an affidavit. In addition, an "information disclosure statement filed in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.97 and 37 CFR § 1.98 will be considered by the examiner assigned to the application." M.P.E.P. § 609. Here, applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 7, 2006, satisfies the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.97 and 37 CFR § 1.98. As such, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider this Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner. Applicant has submitted along with this response a § 1.132 Declaration that the description of the invention is sufficient to permit one skilled in

the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. As a result, the Section 112, first paragraph rejections of claims 1-24 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 11, 19, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Omura, claims 4, 6, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura in view of Cohen, and claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura in view of Cohen and further in view of Micrografx. Even though applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis of these rejections, applicant has amended claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, and 18-20 to further clarify the invention.

Applicant's technique aims to reduce the number of steps required to manipulate multiple objects displayed on a user interface. According to applicant's technique, when a user selects multiple objects (e.g., objects 1 and 2), highlight objects corresponding to the objects 1 and 2 are displayed as, for example, objects with the same shape but different border outlines as objects 1 and 2. In addition to the highlight objects, a multiple selection highlight object that at least partially bounds the highlight objects is displayed and includes features of object manipulation (e.g., handles, axis pins, and other features). As such, when the user manipulates the multiple selection highlight object using the features of object manipulation, the objects 1 and 2 can be manipulated at the same time without grouping or ungrouping the objects 1 and 2.

Omura discloses a technique for selecting and manipulating objects in AUTO CAD 11. According to Omura's technique, objects on a user interface can be selected by surrounding the objects with a rectangle called a "crossing window." (Omura, p. 49.). After the selection, the objects are displayed with dotted lines (i.e., "ghosting") and additional operation can be performed on the selected objects via various menu items (e.g., the "move" command).

Omura cannot form the basis for Section 102 rejections of the pending claims because Omura does not teach or suggest several features of the these claims. For

example, Omura does not disclose "displaying ... a multiple selection highlight object that bounds the selected objects without grouping the selected objects, wherein the multiple selection highlight object ... includes handles for object manipulation," as recited in pending claims 1-11. Instead, Omura discloses a crossing window for selecting multiple objects with a pointing device. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the crossing window corresponds to the multiple selection highlight object of claim 1, Omura neither teaches nor suggests that the crossing window can include handles for object manipulation nor "automatically configuring the selected objects to be manipulated according to the manipulation of the multiple selection highlight object using the handles." The crossing window is simply displayed as a rectangle to show objects being selected. As a result, Omura does not teach displaying the multiple selection highlight object that includes handles for object manipulation and does not suggest such a modification. Moreover, the claims recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 12-19 recite "creating a multiple selection highlight object that bounds the selected objects without grouping the selected objects, wherein the multiple selection highlight object provides visual feedback of the multiple selection of the two or more objects and includes handles for object manipulation." As discussed above, Omura neither teaches nor suggests such handles on the multiple selection highlight object.

Claims 20-24 recite "automatically associating two or more objects to a common reference object in response to a selection of the two or more objects without grouping the selected objects, the common reference object bounds the two or more objects and includes handles for object manipulation." As discussed above, Omura discloses selecting multiple objects by surrounding the objects with a rectangle called a "crossing window." Assuming, *arguendo*, that the "crossing window" corresponds to the common reference object of claim 20-24, Omura neither teaches nor suggests having handles on the crossing window.

Based upon these amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned representative at (206) 359-6038.

Dated: 8/25/06

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Chen Liang
Registration No.: 51,945
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant